WHAT BAPTISTS STAND FOR

WILLIAM DUDLEY NOWLIN, D. D.

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
in memoriam

H. A. BOLLE

presented by

Mrs. E. L. Prine

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Property of
H. H. Bolla

Copyright, 1918
Baptist Book Concern

286
N948

To my Father and Mother, William David Nowlin and Caroline (Glass) Nowlin, who reared a large family and endeavored to inspire them to noble lives, and who entertained high hopes for their success in life, and who now sleep in the beautiful little cemetery at Sharon, Tennessee, is this volume affectionately dedicated by their grateful son.

27982

SOME THINGS BAPTISTS BELIEVE

By G. P. BESWICK

These are some things that Baptists all believe
And recommend all others to receive:
That God's word was inspired through and through
And everything made plain we're bid to do;
That the Godhead consists of, as is shown,
The Father, Son and Spirit, three in one;
That Christ is the "God-man" of heaven's plan
Devised for the soul-ransoming of man;
That men are all so hopelessly depraved
That none can but by sovereign grace be saved;
That none but converts first evangelized
Have any Scripture right to be baptized;
That baptism is immersion—nothing less,
As all great scholars of all creeds confess;
That the Lord's Supper, as the Scripture saith,
Was meant but to commemorate His death.
None but those buried with Christ, as all should know,
Can their Lord's death symbolically show.
None but those who do make their calling sure
Can possibly unto the end endure,
Yet all who do, where'er their lots be cast,
Will most assuredly get to heaven at last.
In the New Testament the pattern's found
For modeling churches all the world around,
And church claims, to be valid anywhere,
Must on all points with this sane pattern square.

CONTENTS

PAGE

A Foreword 7
Introductory Notes 9
What Baptists Stand For 11

I

As to the Scriptures 13
1. The Inspired Word of God 13
2. A Sufficient Rule of Faith and Practice 13
3. A Means of Salvation 14
4. Should Be Preached in All the World 15
5. Any Departure from Its Teachings Dangerous 15

II

As to Individual Responsibility to God..... 17
(Or the Soul's Competency for, and Right of, Spiritual Worship.)
1. Repentance Individual and Vital 17
2. Faith Individual and Indispensable 18
3. Baptism a Personal Duty and a Personal Act . 20
4. Worship is Individual, Not by Proxy 21
5. Good Works the Result, Not the Cause, of Salvation 21

III

As to the Church 22
1. Jesus Established His Church..... 22
2. Composed of Converted and Baptized Persons 23

CONTENTS

3. All Enjoy Equal Rights and Privileges 23
4. The Church Has Two Ordinances 24
(1) Baptism 24
(2) Lord's Supper 35
5. Two Sets of Officers..... 42
(1) Pastors 42
(2) Deacons 42
6. Each Church Independent of Every Other Church 44
7. A Church an Executive Body, Not Legislative 45
8. Duty of Each Member to Support His Church 45
(1) With His Presence..... 45
(2) With His Prayers..... 45
(3) With His Purse..... 45
9. Absolute Separation of Church and State..... 47
(Or Religious Liberty)

IV

As to the Church in Time of War..... 52

V

As to Christian Union..... 59
(Baptists Hold the Grounds, Both Doctrinally and Historically, for Christian Union)
1. Doctrinally 60
(1) How to Kill the Baptists..... 60
(2) Truth Held by Others—Baptist Doctrine. 61
2. Historically 65
(1) A Blackboard Demonstration..... 65
(2) What Historians Say..... 67

A FOREWORD

THE contents of this book were first delivered at the laying of the corner-stone of the First Baptist Church of Arcadia, Florida, September 30, 1911, a copy of which was placed in the stone. After this it was delivered as the "Doctrinal Address" at the fifth-Sunday meeting of the South Florida Association, meeting with Bartow Church, which body, by unanimous vote, called for its publication in permanent form. Later, while the writer was pastor in Knoxville, Tennessee, he, by appointment, delivered this same matter as the "Doctrinal Sermon" of the Tennessee Association, meeting with the Beaver Dam Church, October 7, 1915. This body also, after hearing the sermon, voted to have it put in permanent form and given a wide circulation.

Many brethren have also insisted that this matter be put in permanent form for general use.

Up to this time the writer had not

found time to comply with the requests of his esteemed brethren. However, he is now taking the time from a busy pastorate and his editorial work to prepare the material for such a work as has been called for. While much matter has been added to the original, it will be observed that both the form and the style of the "Sermon" have been preserved. The writer wishes to express his thanks to his good friends, the Rev. J. W. Porter, D.D., LL.D., and the Rev. J. R. Sampey, D.D., LL.D., who read the manuscript, for their "Introductory Notes." With the prayer that the Lord may bless and use this little book, I am yours fraternally,

WM. D. NOWLIN.

PASTOR'S STUDY, Twenty-second and Walnut Streets Baptist Church, Louisville, Ky., Sept. 10, 1917.

INTRODUCTORY NOTES

THE author of this excellent book needs no introduction to Southern Baptists. He has been long and well known as a great preacher, a brilliant editor, and one of our most successful evangelists.

This splendid discourse is characteristic of the man and the preacher, and will commend itself to every thoughtful seeker after truth. It will prove a valuable contribution to the literature on this important subject. We wish for it a wide reading, and a universal acceptance of its truths.

J. W. PORTER.

Dr. W. D. Nowlin's book on "What Baptists Stand For" is a clear, comprehensive, vigorous presentation of the Baptist message. While there may be room for difference of opinion as to the historical succession of churches from the Apostles to the present, the call to propagate churches after the New Testament pattern is loud and insistent. Every country in the world

needs the Baptist message. Our people owe it to themselves, to their Lord and to the world to proclaim the whole truth in love and with boldness until Christians everywhere shall accept the New Testament as the rule of faith and practice.

Baptists must also be as enthusiastic in obeying the command to go and make disciples as they are in obeying the command to baptize. Dr. Nowlin's book is a call to Baptists to obey the Great Commission in its entirety. To Christians who are not Baptists it is a challenge to search the Scriptures with a view to bringing their beliefs and practices into more complete accord with the teachings of God's word.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

WHAT BAPTISTS STAND FOR

Brethren, Ladies and Gentlemen [addressed to a great open-air congregation]:—It gives me great pleasure, on this auspicious occasion, to have the honor of delivering the address on the laying of the corner-stone of this the First Baptist Church of this beautiful little city of Arcadia. You are to be congratulated on this great occasion, and this beautiful structure in course of erection.

When asked to deliver this address, my subject was named, "What Baptists Stand For." It has always been my custom, when asked to marry a couple, to deliver a marriage ceremony, and not a funeral oration; and on this occasion I shall not depart from my well-established custom.

The very subject, "What Baptists Stand For," implies that Baptists stand for certain principles. We might say, "Baptists stand for the Bible, and are Baptists because the Bible makes them such," but some one else might reply, "I am something else

for the same reason." Thus it will be observed that we must be more specific and state what we believe the Bible teaches. Let us notice, then, what we as Baptists stand for as to the Scriptures.

I

AS TO THE SCRIPTURES

1. Baptists believe that the Bible—the Old and New Testaments—is an inspired revelation from God; that it is God's revealed will concerning man, and is the truth. Inspiration, however, is not responsible for errors in translation, nor for the teachings of uninspired speakers. In such cases inspiration is responsible only for the correctness of the original records. Satan said: "All that a man hath will he give for his life." The Bible is not responsible for the lies taught by the Devil. Inspiration is responsible only for the correctness of the record, as to what Satan said.

2. That it is a sufficient rule of faith and practice in all matters of religion. The Bible, being the revealed and authoritative expression of God's will concerning His people, contains all that He would have them believe, do or be religiously. It is the standard of faith and conduct in religion,

and is sufficient in its scope and supreme in its authority. Not the "decrees of the Councils," nor the "traditions of the Fathers," but a "Thus saith the Lord," settles the controversy with Baptists. It is the standard to which all opinions, creeds and conduct should be made to conform. "There is but one lamp to guide my feet. It is the lamp of experience," said Patrick Henry, in his great speech before the Continental Congress. But the Psalmist said, "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." With Baptists, the Bible is the end of the controversy, while with many others it is only the beginning. God's Word is our guide in all matters of religion.

3. That it is used as a means of the salvation of man. "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation," "the Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation," and "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." These and many other Scriptures show that the Word of God is used as a means of salvation. The preached Word, used of the Holy Spirit, brings conviction, which results in salvation. The Word of God is the means,

and the Spirit of God the Agent, in regeneration.

4. That it should be preached in all the world. It follows, naturally, that if the Bible is the Word of God, and is used as a means of salvation, it should be preached to every creature. The world is lost, hopeless and helpless without the gospel, and without it can not be saved. We have the means of its salvation in our possession, and the Master has enjoined it upon us to "disciple the nations," which means bring them to salvation. To the extent that we fail to be evangelistic, just to that extent we fail to be evangelical. The first and greatest mission of a church is to disciple the nations.

5. That any departure from the teachings of the Scriptures is fraught with untold evil. Even the slightest departure from the Word of God is dangerous. In fact, the slight departures are more dangerous than the more flagrant ones, because less apt to be detected and corrected before they become established. It is the thin edge of the rail that turns the train off on the side-track, which the blunt end of the rail would not do. Then, history shows that when people once depart from the strict teachings of the

Scriptures, they continue to drift further away. The Bible is our guide, our line and our plummet. God says: "Judgment will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet." God deals on the square; therefore, we should live on the square.

God will judge men according to the gospel—whether they are willing to abide by it in this life or not. Nearly all the divisions and strife which have come to Christendom have come from taking liberty with God's Word; and practically all the divisions would disappear if men would just let God say what He wants to say and mean what He wants to mean. There is nothing to be gained by making the Bible mean what it does not mean. We have no right to add to or take from the teachings of God's Word.

II

AS TO INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY TO GOD

BAPTISTS believe that every normal individual is responsible to God for himself, and therefore has the capacity for, and right of, spiritual worship. The soul's competency for, and right of, spiritual worship is one of the cardinal principles of the New Testament and one of the fundamental principles of Baptists. We believe:

1. That every one must *repent* for himself. Repentance being, as it is, an inward change of purpose resulting in an outward change of life, can not be performed by one person for another. Repentance is a turning from a life of sin to a life of submission and obedience to God's will. Repentance, as used in the New Testament, means a change of mind, but it is a word of moral significance and does not mean merely a change of opinion. Such a change often takes place without repentance in the New

Testament sense. The will is necessarily and directly involved, as well as the emotions; but in Scriptural repentance there is a change of mind with reference to sin, a sorrow for sin and a turning from sin. This change is wrought by the power of God through the Holy Spirit; the Word of truth being used as a means to convict the sinner of sin and lead him to forsake it, and to resolve henceforth to walk before God in all truth and uprightness. Where there has been no real personal repentance there can be no real personal salvation, for "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

2. That every one must exercise faith for himself. Faith is the laying hold upon eternal life, and is therefore a personal matter. Religion being, as it is, a personal matter, admits of no proxy. One person can not exercise faith for another person. There is an essential difference between *Belief* and *Faith,* which many fail to recognize. The confusion comes from the fact that we make the verb "believe" express the act of both belief and faith. We need a verb ("faithe") to express the act of faith, so we would not have to fall back on believe. Belief is the assent of the mind to a propo-

sition based upon the evidence in the case, while faith is the consent of the heart—not a question of mere evidence, but one of will. We often have to believe things we don't want to believe, but, having the evidence, we must believe: and often we would like to believe things we can't for lack of evidence. But we do not have to exercise faith ("faithe") in, or trust, a person or thing against our will. *Belief* is a question of *evidence,* while *faith* is a question of *will.* Believing that God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, is belief based upon evidence; but that is not saving faith in God. You might believe that until doomsday and yet be lost. The demons believed that and trembled. Belief comes before repentance, while faith comes after. From all the evidence, we believe there is a God; that Christ died, was buried, and arose from the dead; and that we are alienated from God by sin—this is belief. As a result of this belief, conviction seizes us, and, as a result of this conviction for sin, we are turned from sin, and lay hold upon Christ by faith (or "faithe" in Christ). Saving faith includes both *belief* and *trust.* If asked to give the order of

these, I should say, as a result of hearing come belief, conviction, repentance, faith, salvation. You can not separate, in point of time, however, between faith and salvation. They are simultaneous. Without this personal faith it is impossible to be saved, for "he that believeth not shall be damned."

3. That every one must be baptized for himself. Baptism is the first public duty of the Christian, and is the duty of *every* Christian and the duty of Christians *only*. The Scriptures nowhere provide for, nor give recognition of, infant baptism. The only authority we have to baptize anybody is found in the commission (Matt. 28: 19), which says: "Make disciples and baptize them." It does not say, "baptize them provided they have not been baptized in infancy," but baptize *them,* the same that you have made. The specification of one thing in a command, law or contract prohibits every other thing. The specification of *disciples* in the command is the prohibition of all others. This act of obedience can not be performed by proxy. Baptism is a personal duty. Baptists do not believe in baptismal regeneration, but in regenerational baptism.

4. That every one must worship for himself. Worship is an act of obedience, and obedience is the compliance with command: so where there is no command, there can be no obedience, and where there is no obedience, there can be no acceptable worship. It is just as much a sin to go beyond the command and do more in an act of worship than the Word requires, as it is to stop short of the requirements. The Word says: "Judgment will I lay to the line and righteousness to the plummet." Worship is a personal act, and is in obedience to a personal command.

5. That every one must work for himself. We, as a Baptist people, believe in good works, not as a means, but as a result of salvation. We do, not to be saved, but because we are saved. A peach-tree is not a peach-tree because it bears peaches, but it bears peaches because it is a peach-tree. Fruit is the result of life and not the cause of life. The love of Christ should constrain every Christian to good works. "By their fruits ye shall know them." We believe in a personal conviction for sin, a personal repentance, a personal faith, a personal obedience—a personal religion.

III

AS TO THE CHURCH

LET us next notice what we, as Baptists, hold as to the church, or the churches of Christ. Let it be understood in the very outset that when I use the phrase "the church," I refer to the church as an institution and not as an organization. When we speak of the "American college," or the "American home," we do not mean one big college for all America, nor do we mean one big home in which all Americans live. It is understood, of course, that we refer to these only as institutions. This is also true when we say "the church." It is more accurate to say "a church," as the word "church" means a congregation, or assembly.

As Baptists we believe:

1. That Jesus Christ established His church during His earthly ministry; that it was composed of baptized believers, and that to this church He delivered the doctrines, ordinances, discipline and commis-

sion; and that it has been perpetuated through all the ages since. (Further on we have more to say on the perpetuity of the church.) A Baptist church is better than other churches only as she has better doctrines and practices. It is not the name, but the doctrines, that identifies Christ's church.

2. That a church is a congregation of genuinely converted and Scripturally baptized disciples associated together in the covenant of the gospel and carrying out the principles of the Great Commission. Baptists contend for a converted church membership. This is a distinctive Baptist doctrine. The churches exist in obedience to the command of Christ and have no other mission than the carrying out of His will. A church is an executive, and not a legislative, body. Her mission is to know, and then to do, the Master's will.

3. That in this church all enjoy equal rights and privileges. In the New Testament churches there were no high seats and low seats, nor high officials and low officials. All enjoyed equal rights and privileges. Some got more out of their church fellowship than others, because they put more into it. Some to-day get far more out of their religion,

and out of their church fellowship, than others; but this difference is not one of position, but of service and development. Faithful Christian service has its rewards. Some will get more out of heaven than others because of a larger capacity for the enjoyment of heaven.

4. That the church has but two ordinances—baptism and the Lord's Supper. In these two ordinances we have a complete picture of the gospel—the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Paul says: "I declare unto you the gospel—how Christ died, was buried and rose again."

(1) Baptism is the immersion of a believer in water upon a profession of his faith in Christ as his personal Saviour, by the authority of the church, with a proper design—which design is to symbolize a burial and resurrection. It is hardly necessary on this occasion to take time to discuss in detail the Scriptural subject—a believer; the Scriptural act—immersion; the Scriptural authority—a New Testament church, and the Scriptural design—a burial; of baptism; so I shall give you the barest outline. Our commission is to "make disciples and baptize them," and this is in harmony

with the other Scriptures on baptism. There is no deviation from this order in God's Word, neither in precept nor in example.

John made and baptized disciples. "Christ made and baptized more disciples than John." "They that gladly received the word were baptized." "As many as believed were baptized." These and many other Scriptures show that baptism was received by the believer, and the believer only. The only Scriptural subject for baptism is a disciple, or believer. The only authority we have for baptism is in the commission which says: "Make disciples and baptize them." The specification of one thing in a law, command or contract is always the prohibition of every other thing. When God specified that the Ark should be built of gopher wood, the specification of gopher wood was itself the prohibition of every other wood in the world. When the commission says, "Make *disciples* and baptize *them*"—the disciples—the specification of "*disciples*" is the prohibition of all others. "*Them*" is a pronoun and has for its antecedent "*disciples*," and a pronoun can never include more, nor less, than is included in its antecedent. We should "learn not to go

beyond the things which are written" (1 Cor. 4:6—R. V.). There is neither precept nor example in the Scriptures for the baptism of non-believers. And whenever we baptize a believer (and we are commanded to baptize no other) we baptize one who is justified, or saved; for "by him all who believe are justified" (Acts 13:39). Baptists baptize the children of God, not the children of the Devil. There are but two classes—the children of God and the children of the Devil. There is no neutral ground. Whose children do you baptize? If we baptize anybody, we must either baptize the children of God or the children of the Devil—there is nobody else to be baptized. The Scriptures also show that the ordinances were delivered to the churches, and that they were administered by them. The churches are the custodians of the ordinances. Baptism is administered by the authority of the church.

THE SCRIPTURAL ACT OF BAPTISM REQUIRES:

I. WATER.

"Here is *water:* what doth hinder me to be baptized?" (Acts 8:36). "Can any

man forbid *water* that these should not be baptized?" (Acts 10:47). Then, the Scriptural act of baptism requires *"water."*

II. MUCH WATER.

"And John was also baptizing in Enon near to Salim, *because* there was *much water* there" (John 3:23). "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the *river of Jordan*" (Mark 1:5). Then, the Scriptural act of baptism requires *"much water."*

III. GOING DOWN INTO THE WATER.

"And they went *down both into the water,* both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him" (Acts 8:38). Then, the Scriptural act of baptism requires *"going down into the water."*

IV. A BURIAL.

"Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism* into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection" (Rom. 6:4-6). *"Buried with him*

in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead" (Col. 2:12). Then, the Scriptural act of baptism requires one to be *"buried in baptism,"* and raised *"in the likeness of his resurrection."*

V. Coming up Out of the Water.

"And Jesus when he was baptized went *up* straightway *out of the water"* (Matt. 3:16). "And when they were *come up out of the water,* the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more" (Acts 8:39). "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John *in Jordan.* And straightway *coming up out of the water,* he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him" (Mark 1:9, 10). Then, the Scriptural act of baptism requires a *"coming up out of the water."*

It will be observed that I have not taken one Scripture which mentions "baptism" and another which mentions a "burial," and put them together to make out a case. I have not taken one Scripture which speaks

of baptism and another which speaks of "going down into the water," nor have I taken one Scripture which mentions baptism and another which speaks of "coming up out of the water," and put them together to make out a case; but I have taken the Scriptures which speak of *"buried in baptism," "And they went down into the water . . . and he baptized him," "And Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water."* No, the *case* is made out in the Scriptures. It takes no juggling.

Which of the two, *immersion* or *sprinkling,* meets the conditions of the Scriptural act of baptism? Let us put them both to the test and see.

Immersion requires:	*Sprinkling requires:*
I. Water.	I. Water.
II. Much water.	II. 0
III. Going down into the water.	III. 0
IV. A burial.	IV. 0
V. Coming up out of the water.	V. 0

Thus it will be seen that *immersion* supplies every element of the Scriptural act of baptism: *"water," "much water," "going*

down into the water," "buried in baptism," "coming up out of the water." Things equal to each other are equal to the same thing; therefore, *immersion* is equal to the Scriptural act of baptism.

Sprinkling, possessing, as it does, only one element of the Scriptural act of baptism —water—is not equal to, and therefore can not be, the Scriptural act of baptism.

To say that immersion is equal to baptism and that sprinkling is equal to baptism is equivalent to saying immersion and sprinkling are equal to each other, which is quite absurd.

"If a man love me, he will keep my words" (John 14:23). "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6:46). "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it" (John 2:5). "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (John 13:17).

The Scriptures also show that the design of baptism is to declare, and not to procure, something. Baptism is to show "the likeness of his death" and "the likeness of his resurrection," and anything which fails to show the likeness of a burial and a resur-

rection fails of the symbolism of baptism. Many quotations from scholars and lexicons might be given, but they are not necessary here. We give a few, however, which are to the point.

Rev. W. H. Menzer, of Hazelton, Pennsylvania, very aptly calls attention in the *Examiner* to the fact that when the New Testament "wants to speak of washing *a part,* the word *nipto* is used; when to speak of washing the *whole,* the word *louo* or *apolouo* is used; when to speak of *moistening* or *wetting,* the word *brecho* is used; when to speak of *pouring out,* or *on,* the word *proscheo* is used; when to speak of *sprinkling,* the word *rantizo* is used; when to speak of *baptizing,* the word *baptizo* is used. And the remarkable thing is that the only word of these seven that is ever used in connection with baptism is *baptizo.* None of the other six words is used interchangeably or synonymously with the seventh word, which alone is used in connection with the act of baptism." Exactly so. If baptism means immersion, sprinkling or pouring, why should not the Greek words which mean these things be used interchangeably? But they never are. *Why?* Well, for the

simple reason that they do not teach what baptism is intended to symbolize. Pedobaptists can explain *baptizo,* but there is one thing they can't do; that is, translate it. No scholar will translate *baptizo* "sprinkle" or "pour."

Prof. A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., one of the foremost Greek scholars of our times, furnishes a brief statement of the scholarship of the world in relation to the act of baptism. He says:

The testimony of modern scholars on the subject of immersion as the baptism of the New Testament is as unanimous as one can ever expect to find on any question of scholarship.

All the modern lexicons give no other meaning for *baptizo* but "dip" or "immerse." Here is the new work of Dr. Erwin Preuschen, of Hirschhorn a. Neckar, Germany: "Vollstaendiges Griechish-Deutsches Handwoerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen urchristlichen Literatur" (1908). Here only *taufen,* to dip; *ins Wasser tauchen,* to plunge into water.

The latest New Testament lexicon is that by Heinrich Ebeling, another German, who wrote, in Rome (1913): "Griechish-Deutsches Woerterbuch zum neuen Testamente." Here, also, the meaning is given as *tauchen ein, unter*—dip in, under. The newest German lexicographers stand where the lexicons of Liddell and Scott, Sophocles, Thayer and the rest do.

In Hastings' "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels" the article on baptism is by the late Marcus Dods, the

great New Testament scholar of New College (Presbyterian), Edinburgh, Scotland.

"This eminent Presbyterian scholar says in the article mentioned: 'To use Pauline language, this old man is dead and buried in the water and he rises from this cleansing grave a new man. The full significance of the rite would have been lost had immersion not been practiced.'

"I take down at random a bunch of the greatest modern commentators from my shelves, and I do not quote from a single Baptist for obvious reasons.

"Here is Plummer's new and noble commentary on Matthew (1909). He is talking about John the Baptist (p. 28): 'It is his office to bind them to a new life, symbolized by immersion in water.' No Baptist would ask for a change of a word here. Dr. Alfred Plummer is a member of the Church of England and one of the greatest of modern scholars.

"Look at Sanday and Headlam on Rom. 6:1-14 (p. 153): 'It expresses symbolically a series of acts corresponding to the redeeming acts of Christ. Immersion—death. Submersion—burial (the ratification of death). Emergence—resurrection.'

"Both Sanday and Headlam belong to the Church of England. Sanday has long been the leading New Testament scholar of that denomination.

"Bishop Westcott, also of the Church of England, in his 'Commentary on the Gospel of John' (Vol. I., p. 143), says: 'The sacrament of baptism presupposes the death and resurrection of Christ.'

"Turn to Bishop Lightfoot, the greatest New Testament scholar of the nineteenth century, also a member of the Church of England. In his 'Commentary on Colossians' (p. 182), read: 'Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his

corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. . . . Thus baptism is an image of his participation both in the death and in the resurrection of Christ.' Surely that is strong enough for any Baptist.

"I next pick up Swete on Mark. Swete is the modern successor of Lightfoot and Westcott at the Cambridge University. He comments on Mark 1:9, 'with the added thought of immersion, which gives vividness to the scene.'

"Once more, not to become wearisome and monotonous, here is James Denney, of the United Free Church College (Presbyterian), Glasgow. In his 'Commentary on Romans' (6:4, p. 632), he says: 'Therefore we were buried with him [in the act of immersion] through that baptism into his death, and a kind of seal to its reality.'

"It would be easy to multiply such testimony from other great pedobaptist scholars all over the world. But enough is enough. The matter is now simply taken for granted by the best scholars everywhere."

This testimony is sufficient for any unbiased mind. Those who symbolize the Lord's death in the Supper and fail to symbolize His resurrection in baptism, symbolically at least, worship a dead Christ. In the Lord's Supper they say, "We symbolize our Lord's death," but, having no symbol of His resurrection, they leave Him in the grave—symbolically. Baptists worship a crucified, buried and risen Lord, which facts they symbolize in the ordinances, and for which the ordinances were instituted. If

immersion should be abandoned as the Scriptural act of baptism, it would not be long until the doctrine of the resurrection would be surrendered. Indeed, some now deny the doctrine of the resurrection in order to escape the symbolism of immersion.

An Episcopalian minister in New York is quoted as saying: "The Baptists have marked advantages over us all. Their baptism is a mighty power. They have only to read the Book and do the thing, and every one who hears the command of the Lord, and who witnesses the act of baptism, sees at once the harmony between the two."

(2) The Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, and is to be participated in by her members, and is designed to keep before the world the great fundamental fact of Christianity—the sacrificial death of Christ—till He comes again. Baptists are restricted communionists, and in this they are like their brethren of other denominations. Some people seem to think that restricted communion is the one thing that differentiates Baptists from all other denominations; while, as a matter of fact, this (the fact of restricted communion) is one point of

perfect agreement between Baptists and other denominations. To show that Baptists are in agreement with other denominations on the terms of communion, I quote here from leading scholars and historians. Neander, the great church historian, speaking of the observance of the Lord's Supper in the first century, says: "At this celebration, as may be easily concluded, no one could be present who was not a member of the Christian church, and incorporated into it by the rite of baptism." Justin Martyr, who wrote in the middle of the second century, says of the Lord's Supper: "This food is called by us the eucharist, of which it is not lawful for any one to partake but such as believe the things taught by us, and have been baptized" (Apol. Ic. 65-66; Neander, Ch. Hist., Vol. I, p. 327). Dr. Wall, a leading Episcopalian, says: "No church ever gave the communion to any before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that were ever held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized" (Hist. Inft. Bapt., Part II., c. 9). Dr. Doddridge, a Presbyterian, says: "It is certain that, so far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity

reaches, no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper" (Lectures, pp. 5, 11, 12). Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler, Presbyterian, says, in his letter to Dr. Christian ("Close Communion," p. 83): "I do not suppose there is any difference between the Presbyterians and the Baptists in the terms of communion."

The Episcopal Prayer Book says: "And there shall none be admitted to the holy communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." Dr. Tyerman (Methodist) says: "Even in Georgia, Wesley excluded Dissenters from the holy communion, on the ground that they had not been properly baptized, and he would himself baptize only by immersion, unless the child or person was in a weak state of health" (*Oxford Methodist,* p. 6). The "Methodist Discipline" says: "No person shall be admitted to the Lord's Supper among us who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member of our church" (Sec. 408). And they say they will exclude those "who hold and disseminate, publicly or privately, doctrines which are contrary to our articles of religion." That excludes all Baptists. Alexander Campbell says: "But I do object to

making it a rule in any case to receive unimmersed persons to church ordinances." Moses E. Lard, one of Campbell's disciples, says: "In the outset of the Reformation our motto was, 'And thus saith the Lord for every article of our faith is a precept or precedent for all we do.' In the light of this cherished postulate, what defense can we plead for our act when we sit down to commune with unimmersed?"

The two leading Presbyterian papers in the United States are the *Observer,* New York City, and the *Interior,* Chicago. The *Observer* speaks as follows: "It is not a want of charity which compels the Baptist to restrict his invitation. He has no hesitation in admitting the personal piety of his unimmersed brethren. Presbyterians do not invite the unbaptized, however pious they may be. It is not uncharitable. It is not bigotry on the part of Baptists to confine their communion to those they consider baptized."

The *Interior* says: "The difference between our Baptist brethren and ourselves is an important difference. We agree with them, however, in saying that unbaptized persons should not partake of the Lord's

Supper. Their views compel them to think that we are not baptized, and shuts them up to close communion. Close communion is, in our judgment, a more defensible position than open communion, which is justified on the ground that baptism is not a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper. To charge Baptists with bigotry because they abide by the logical consequences of their position is absurd."

The *Episcopal Recorder* says: "No Christian church would willingly receive to its communion even the humblest and truest believer in Christ who had not been baptized. With the Baptist, immersion only is baptism, and he therefore of necessity excludes from the Lord's table all who have not been immersed. It is an essential part of the system—the legitimate carrying out of this creed" ("The Faith of the Baptists," pp. 84-86).

Thus it will be seen that all denominations are restricted communionists. Baptists are as anxious as anybody that we should be together at the Lord's table. But every argument in favor of being together at the Lord's table would be an argument in favor of being together before we get to the

table, and remaining together after we leave the table. There is no good reason for being *one* at the table and then being *many* when we get away from the table. It will be observed that we practice what we preach (restricted communion), while others preach what we practice (restricted communion), and then practice something else.

Two ministers, a Baptist and a Disciple, met on a train on Monday morning (this is a true story) after preaching in the same town on Sunday. Brother B. (the Baptist) said to Brother S. (the Disciple): "Brother S., you preached in —— yesterday, did you?" S. "Yes, I did." B. "You observed the Lord's Supper, as is your custom, did you?" S. "Yes." B. "And we will say, which is likely true, a pedobaptist came and communed with you." S. "Yes, some did." B. "Now, Brother S., you believe that baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper, and that nothing is baptism but immersion, do you not?" S. "Yes, I believe all of that." B. "Now, Brother S., if baptism, as you admit, comes before the Lord's Supper, and if nothing is baptism, as you claim, but immersion, how can you reconcile your doctrine with your practice when you adminis-

ter the Lord's Supper to the unimmersed?" S. "His baptism would not satisfy me, but if it satisfies him I have no right to say to him nay. I have no right to sit on another person's conscience." B. "Then, Brother S., you say baptism is a matter of conscience, and that you have no right to sit on another's conscience?" S. "Yes." B. "Now, Brother S., suppose that that same pedo-baptist, who has been sprinkled for baptism, and to whom you administered the Lord's Supper in the morning, and of whom you say, 'I have no right to sit on his conscience as to his baptism; if it satisfies him, I have no right to say to him nay,' should come at night to join your church, saying, 'I am satisfied with my baptism. I have a good conscience on that subject and wish to be received on my baptism,' would you receive him, Brother S.?" S. "Why, no!" B. "Why not, Brother S.?" S. "Because he has not been baptized." B. "What right have you to sit on his conscience at night as to his baptism, when you had 'no right to sit on his conscience as to his baptism' at the morning service?" S.—— The question is still unanswered.

Baptists hold that only those who have

been genuinely converted, Scripturally baptized, and are walking orderly in the fellowship of the gospel, have any right to come to the Lord's Supper. This is restricted communion, and is the only Scriptural, consistent and logical position on this question.

Open communion is made possible only by a flagrant violation of the Master's command to *"be one."* Open communion is communion participated in by different denominations—people of different doctrines and practices—a thing positively condemned by Paul when he said, "When ye come together in the church I hear that divisions exist among you. . . . When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper." In apostolic times, open communion was impossible, as there were no different denominations, the essentials to open communion. Open communion, then, is a result of an open violation of Christ's command; and the result of a wrong can not be right.

5. That the church has but two officers, or sets of officers—pastors and deacons. (1) The pastor is to give himself to the spiritual interests of the church. (2) The

deacons are to look after the material, or financial, interests of the church. We learn from the sixth chapter of Acts that the deacons were appointed to serve tables, or look after the poor, that the ministers might give themselves to prayer and the ministry of the Word. We would have a much stronger, more spiritual and efficient ministry to-day if the deacons would relieve the ministers of all the temporal interests of the churches, allowing them to give their time and strength to prayer and the study of the Word. Many things are required of the preacher to-day which weaken and make sterile his preaching. Vital force is a limited quantity, in preachers, as well as in others. Some deacons seem to think their only business is to tell the pastor when to resign. The removal of a pastor is not the cure for all the ills of a church. Many a time, after the pastor has left the church, the trouble is still there. In many cases the removal of a non-progressive, stingy deacon, or Sunday-school superintendent without qualifications or character, and who for a score or more years has been sitting on the lid, would be the dawn of a new day for the church. The trouble the pastor is ac-

cused of stirring up is often the result of his effort to push the work over the protest of these inefficient, non-progressive, would-be leaders. No man should attempt to serve a church beyond his usefulness, whether pastor or deacon.

The deacon has a very important position, and many of them fill this position with credit to themselves and to the office.

6. That each church is independent of every other congregation and is capable of transacting its own business, without aid or interference; and from its decision there is no appeal. This very independence, however, gives her the right, if she so chooses, to co-operate with other churches in furthering the interests of the cause; and this co-operation in no way involves her independency. No church, group of churches, convention or association has any authority over any other church. Co-operation in Christian work, however, is one of the privileges of the churches of Jesus Christ. But in so doing they do not constitute an ecclesiasticism with functions and powers to be authoritatively exercised over the individual churches. This is a Baptist fundamental.

7. That a church is not a legislative, but an executive, body. It is not the business of a church to make laws, but to execute those laws made for her by the Master, who is the head of the church. The only business of a church is to find out what her Lord wants her to do and then do it, and do it in the Lord's way, and for the Lord's glory. The church that is doing the Lord's will is the Lord's church, whatever its name. The doing is the test.

8. That it is the duty of every member of a church to support his church with (1) his presence, (2) his prayers and (3) his purse—which every one covenants to do when he joins a church. No member has the right to absent himself from the worship of his church unless providentially prevented. Many of our members too lightly estimate, and too carelessly treat, the worship of the Lord's house. Then, many forget that it is the solemn duty of every member of the church to pray for the success of his church. More things are wrought by prayer than any of us imagine. But we are not only to support our church with our presence and our prayers, but with our purse. How few of us render unto the

Lord that which belongs to Him. A part of the income of every one belongs to the Lord, and to withhold that which belongs to the Lord is called "robbing God." Now, if a certain part of our income belongs to God, what part? Has God left us in the dark as to our duty at this point? Our God is not a God of confusion, but a God of system. Now, we know the Jew was required to give one-tenth—in fact, a good deal more, when all the offerings are counted. But some one replies that "the old law of the tithe has been repealed." But how do you know that? The paying of tithes is a fundamental principle and was in use long before the law of Moses was given, and if you could prove that the Mosaic law was repealed, it would not affect a fundamental law which was in operation before the Mosaic law was given. Neither Christ nor the apostles condemn the paying of tithes, as a law which has been abolished. We find Christ, however, in Matt. 23: 23, saying to the scribes and Pharisees that "ye pay tithes" even of your vegetables in the garden, and then He says "this ought ye to have done," but you should have done some other things too.

Now, this would have been a good time for Jesus to say, "The law of the tithe is done away," if that had been true. I believe every Christian ought to do as much under grace as the Jew was required to do under law. This is the very minimum, not the maximum. If all our church-members would pay the tithe into the storehouse of the Lord, and do it "on the first day of the week," as Paul teaches, we would have practically all our financial problems solved. We soon would have no debts to clog the wheels of Zion; we would have no "big givers" and "little givers," for all would be giving alike. Then we would have no trouble about "my part" and "your part." And how we would all prosper and be happy in the worship of the Lord if we would only do our duty. Those who have experienced this joy will not give up tithing.

9. That we believe in the absolute separation of church and state. While, in a sense, the state and the church are both divine institutions, they function in different spheres. The state is a secular institution, administering secular affairs, armed with authority to carry out her mandates; while

the church is a spiritual institution, administering spiritual religion, the very essence of which is voluntariness. There can be no compulsory religion, since compulsion destroys the very essence of religion. Whenever the state interposes in matters of religion it substitutes external authority—the essence of government—for internal freedom —the essence of religion—and therefore defeats its own ends. While the state has no right to lay its hand upon religion and exercise authority over it, neither has religion the right to lay hold of the arm of the law and use it for her ends. This is essentially the same error from different standpoints. By the absolute separation of church and state, Baptists mean that the state has no right to administer the affairs of the church, neither has the church any right to administer the affairs of the state. This is the glorious doctrine of religious liberty, for which many of our noble brethren have suffered and died. For this doctrine Bunyan languished for twelve long years in Bedford's dismal dungeon; for this doctrine Obadiah Holmes, Ezekiel Holoman and others suffered in our own America.

That the world is indebted to the Baptists for religious liberty we hardly think any well-informed person will deny. The great historian Bancroft says: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was from the first the trophy of the Baptists." It is claimed that the very government under which we live was modeled after the government of a Baptist church. Baptists have not contended for religious liberty for themselves alone, but for all others as well. Liberty does not mean license, however, but the right to obey law.

Disobedience is not only subversive of order, which is "heaven's first law," but tends to slavery and moral degradation. "God is a God of order, and not of confusion." This order is secured by law, the breach of which leads to anarchy and distrust. Nothing is secure where lawlessness reigns. The very liberty which disobedience seeks, by breaking through the restraints of law, is sacrificed and made impossible, for the very meaning of liberty is action in harmony with law. Every person has the right to worship God according to his best understanding of the teachings of the Bible. I do not say "according to the dictates of

his conscience"; he has this right as against men, but he hasn't this right as against God. Whatever religious right we have, we get from the Word of God, and we nowhere find in it that we are to worship according to the dictates of our consciences. The Bible is the law by which we are to live and by which we are to be judged. If an infallible guide is given every man, in the way of conscience, then, what is right for one man may be wrong for another, and what is right for one man to-day may be wrong for that same man to-morrow; this, you see, would destroy the eternal distinction between right and wrong. Paul says, "God will judge men according to my gospel," not their consciences. Religious liberty means that no man has the right to say how we shall worship God, but it does not mean that God hasn't this right. The revealed will of God —not conscience—is the Christian's supreme standard in all matters of religion. And the very fact that God requires us to accept and obey His commands, and that He will reward or punish us according to His Word, is sufficient proof that His Word can be understood. Our *duty* to "disciple all nations" implies clearly that all are subjects

of gospel address and that all have the capacity for discipleship—or the soul's competency for spiritual worship. This is the great doctrine of "religious liberty," for which the world is indebted to the Baptists.

IV

AS TO THE CHURCH IN TIME OF WAR

[This chapter has been added to the original.]

BAPTISTS believe that the churches of Christ have a distinct mission to perform in time of war; and this mission should never be overlooked or confused with that of the state.

He who was the world's greatest teacher; who was calm and serene in the midst of turmoil; who was quiet and reserved in the midst of the most exciting times; who was being tried from every angle by men who were deliberately attempting to accomplish his downfall—quietly said: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." In this Scripture there is a distinct recognition of both the state and the church; and it enjoins upon every man alike loyalty to his country and loyalty to his God.

This Scripture not only recognizes the claims of Cæsar and the claims of God, but recognizes them as separate and distinct. In times of war and in the midst of excitement, this distinction is often lost sight of, and to the harm of both state and church. The separation of church and state is fundamental, and a clear understanding of the separate offices of the two, and the different functions which they are to perform, will greatly enhance the efficiency and esteem of both state and religion.

The church has no more right to attempt to perform the functions of the state than the state has to attempt to perform the functions of the church. It is the same old error from different standpoints.

Every citizen owes loyalty to his Government; this loyalty, however, arises from his relationship to the Government, as a citizen. Relations create obligations; and no person should be willing to sustain any relationship in life who is unwilling to perform the duties arising from that relationship. Our citizenship carries with it obligations to the Government, but these obligations grow out of our citizenship—not our religion. This distinction is fundamental.

If our obligations to the Government grew out of our religion, then those who are not religious would have no obligations to the Government. The injunction, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," shows clearly that Jesus recognized the human government and its obligations. Jesus also shows his recognition of the human government and its obligation by paying the tribute that was exacted. However, Jesus teaches clearly and positively that paying our debt to Cæsar does not pay our debt to God; for he adds, "and unto God the things that are God's." The payment of our debt to one does not release us of our obligation to the other; and this shows the absolute separateness and distinctness of the two. It also refutes the dangerous and fatal doctrine being taught by some, at least by implication, that those who die on the battlefield will be saved; that their death "will be for all men—a Calvary death." The Bible nowhere teaches that death on the battlefield is a means of salvation; and we, as Christians, should not so far lose our equilibrium in these exciting times as to make statements that would suggest such a doctrine.

The writer believes that he, as a good citizen, owes loyalty and support to his Government, and this he gladly renders, but he does not believe that this obligation grows out of his religion, but out of his citizenship. The only legitimate way in which one could say that his religion had anything to do with his obligation to the state is that his religion makes it obligatory upon him to do at all times, and under all circumstances, that which is right, whether that duty arises from a religious obligation or some other source. However, state obligations grow out of state relations, and divine obligations grow out of divine relations.

The mission of the church of Christ in times of war is exactly the mission of the church in times of peace. When Jesus gave his church the great commission, he gave to her a worthy and adequate task for all times and all climes. Neither change of conditions nor change of climate makes any change in the mission of the church. Whatever may be the mission of the state, and whatever functions she may have to perform to maintain her high ideals of civilization, and whatever part the indi-

vidual church-member may have to take in this conflict, let it be remembered that the church of Christ can not become blood-thirsty nor revengeful, without forfeiting her Spirit and destroying her usefulness.

We wish to commend most heartily the strong and significant statement put forth by the Presbyterians, lately in session in Dallas, Texas, in the following:

"When liberty is threatened, the church takes its most exalted position in prostration and humility before God. In the midst of the tremendous energy evoked by the necessity for material and military preparedness, in the midst of the fine endeavor of the men of our land to make America strong in resources and efficient in action, the voice of the church, like the voice of a prophet, should be lifted to call the nation back to God and to justice, to mercy and to humility. The task of the church is to furnish and guide the mind and heart of man with the courage and hope of the gospel, to re-establish the shattered ideals of human brotherhood and of righteous good will and peace, and to give expression to our confidence in the undivided unity of faith in Christ Jesus our Lord, among men of all nations, even though strife may alienate them one from another. We, therefore, reaffirm our unity in the Spirit with the Christian men of the nations with which we are associated, and of the nations with which we are at strife; and we declare our readiness to join with them in finding some just way of bringing this war to an end."

Then, in harmony with these righteous sentiments, the General Assembly calls upon

its own people to "present themselves unitedly before God in penitence and prayer, to beseech His forgiveness and mercy, to affirm faith in His unchangeable goodness, and confidence in His lovingkindness to save our country and bring relief to a world of burdened men."

No one can deny that these statements breathe the spirit of the Master, who taught us to live peaceful lives and to pray for our enemies. The church of Christ should do nothing in times of war which will make futile her efforts to reach and influence the world for good after the war is over. Whether or not the church of Christ is going to be strong and efficient in re-establishing the shattered ideals of civilization, the doctrine of the common brotherhood of man, and the high and holy ideals of Christianity—peace on earth and good will to men—after the war, depends upon how she stands the test and performs her function —which is purely a spiritual one—during this distressing conflict. The church will best serve the nation by rightly understanding her relation to it, and by maintaining that separateness and distinctness of mission which are divine, and that calmness and

serenity of spirit which will enable her to call the nations back to God after the storm has cleared away.

Only with this understanding, and in this spirit, will the church best serve the nation and the world, in this stressful period, and be best prepared to perform her mission to the whole world after peace has been restored, and when the nations shall learn war no more, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge and the glory of God.

Let the church of the living God exert her power at a throne of grace to bring about a speedy, an honorable and a permanent peace; a peace in harmony with the principles of righteousness and liberty; a peace secured on such terms as will make war impossible, and guarantee to all mankind civil and religious liberty.

V

AS TO CHRISTIAN UNION

At the present time, perhaps, no other question is attracting more attention in religious circles than the question of "Christian Union."

Baptists are desirous of Christian union; however, we are not willing to pay the price, nor accept the kind of union urged by some. The union which Baptists desire is the kind Christ prayed for in John 17: 22: "That they may be one, even as we are one"—*unity* rather than a *union.* You can not compromise on a principle. A thing is either right or it is wrong. Whenever two persons, differing (one right and one wrong), compromise, then they are both wrong. One departs from the truth, and the other does not come to the truth. To compromise on a truth is to surrender the truth.

Baptists hold, both *doctrinally* and *historically,* practical grounds for *union;* yes, for *unity* in faith and practice.

1. *Doctrinally.* Baptists are just coming into their rightful heritage in the thought of the world. In times past, Baptists were considered a very insignificant people, holding a few isolated and unpopular principles which separated them from other religious bodies; but a great change has taken place in the world's thought; and to-day the greatness of the Baptist people, the superiority and catholicity of their faith are recognized by all. The world is beginning to realize that the Baptist faith is the most catholic of all faiths, and that what is known as the "Catholic faith" is the most non-catholic of all faiths.

(1) HOW TO KILL THE BAPTISTS.

In the "Life and Writings of Dr. R. C. Burleson" is found the following note:

"The learned and venerable Dr. A., in an address to his class in a certain theological seminary, said: 'Young brethren, one question which you will have to meet, is the controversy on baptism. The Baptists are very numerous all over the world. They are establishing colleges and schools everywhere, and you will have to meet them in argument at every point.

"'I forewarn you they can never be killed by persecution; this was tried all over Europe for eighteen hundred years and also in the New England States. The fires of Smithfield and elsewhere were kindled in vain.

"'The exile of Roger Williams and the whipping

of Holmes were bright eras in Baptist history. Their church has risen from the ashes of persecution, like a phœnix, more beautiful and powerful.

"'It will be equally useless to meet with them in public debate, for controversy is the element in which they flourish. Their pastors, with nothing but old Bunyan's Jerusalem blade, are more than a match for doctors of divinity. On matters of doctrine they think they have the authority of God's Word; and you might as well try to chunk Pike's Peak to pieces with pebbles as to convince them to the contrary.

"'The truth is, there is but one way to kill the Baptists, and that is to hug them to death. I mean, kill them with kindness. Call them "dear brethren," invite them to your communion table, urge them to unite with you as brethren and leave off the discussion of doctrinal questions. This is the most effective and, indeed, the only way to kill the Baptists.'"

The reason why the Baptist faith has stood the test of time and persecution—fire and sword—and come out victorious, is that it is *"the truth,"* and "the truth" has nothing to fear from truth; since no truth can contradict any other truth. Then, if Baptists hold "the truth," to whatever extent other denominations hold "the truth," they hold it in common with Baptists.

(2) A little reflection and careful investigation will reveal the fact that all the truth held and taught by other denominations is held and taught by Baptists. They may hold and teach many other things; but where

they hold the truth, and where there is general agreement among them on any principle, it will be found that that principle is a Baptist principle. If we eliminate the things on which we differ and retain those upon which we are agreed, we have left the Baptist faith.

Of course, there is general agreement, among practically all the denominations, on the great cardinal facts of the sacrificial death of Christ, repentance, faith and Christian obedience. Baptists hold all these. All agree that the Bible is the revealed will of God and the rule of faith and practice, but some want to add to this rule the "bulls of the popes," the "decrees of the Councils" or "traditions of the Fathers"; but we are not agreed on these, so we cut them off. Again, all denominations agree that a converted disciple is a proper subject for gospel baptism. Some of them hold that others are proper subjects also, but all do agree that a converted disciple is a proper subject. That is a well-known Baptist doctrine—believer's baptism.

If you take the question of the act of baptism, you will find that this principle holds good. All denominations admit that

immersion is Scriptural baptism. To be sure, some of them say there are other Scriptural forms of baptism, but they do all agree that immersion is Scriptural. The Greek Catholics immerse, and the Roman Catholics admit that the apostolic mode of baptism was immersion; that "the church" changed it to affusion. Thus, by the process of cancellation, you will find when you get back to a form of baptism admitted by all to be Scriptural, you have only immersion. This again puts us on Baptist ground.

The immersionist conscientiously believes that nothing but immersion is Christian baptism, while the affusionist does not thus regard either sprinkling or pouring. In one case it is a question of conscience and in the other a question of convenience. Who should yield, for the sake of union, under such conditions?

Then, again, all admit that the converted and Scripturally baptized disciple, walking orderly in the fellowship of his church, is a proper communicant at the Lord's Supper. True, some of them admit others, but they do all agree that the above described disciple is a proper communicant. All denomi-

nations teach that only those Scripturally baptized and in church fellowship, as we have shcwn, are admitted to the Lord's table. This is "restricted communion," and a Baptist principle.

It will be observed, again, that it matters not whether one holds the Presbyterian or the Episcopalian form of church government, there is a general agreement that a congregation of genuinely converted, Scripturally baptized disciples, associated together in the covenant of the gospel, and carrying out the principles of the "Great Commission," apart from any other ecclesiastical organization, is a New Testament church. This, also, is a Baptist principle, or, in other words, a congregational form of church government, and the only form known to the Scriptures.

Thus it will be seen that the Baptist faith is the most catholic of all faiths, and that the principles held in common by the other denominations are Baptist principles, and that wherein they differ among themselves is wherein they depart from the truth and wherein they differ from Baptists.

A clear recognition and general acceptance of the above facts would result in a

Christian union, and the only union that can ever mean unity—united on the truth.

By a simple process of cancellation, canceling all the doctrines not held in common, leaving those admitted by all to be Scriptural and true, we have left practically the Baptist faith. The Bible the only rule of faith and practice; a converted person the only proper subject of baptism; immersion the only Scriptural act of baptism; the genuinely converted and Scripturally baptized the only proper communicant at the Lord's table; a congregation of genuinely converted and Scripturally baptized persons associated in a covenant of the gospel and carrying out the principles of the great commission, a New Testament church. What have we, then, but a full-fledged Baptist church?

2. *Historically*. This same process, historically, will give us the same results.

(1) Suppose we begin at the top of a blackboard and put down first the New Testament church—no date—and then the different denominations in order of their beginning, for we can give the date of every one—except the Baptist—from the first down to the latest. Then, believing "Christian union" to be the proper thing, we be-

gin in reverse order, blotting out the denominations from the latest back to the first. When we get back to where there is but one, we shall have, no doubt, the one organized by Christ Himself; and of which He said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" and again, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." In this way we shall find that denomination whose origin, historians tell us, is "hid in the remotest depths of antiquity," and "which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all the ages." This is practical "Christian union."

Dr. Geo. W. McDaniel well says:

"Baptists are justly proud of their beginning—the New Testament. They have an ancient and Scriptural origin. Certain characters in history are named as founders of various denominations: The Disciples began with Alexander Campbell, the Methodists with John Wesley, the Presbyterians with John Calvin, the Lutherans with Martin Luther, and the Church of England with Henry VIII. Not so with the Baptists. There is no personality this side of Jesus Christ who is a satisfactory explanation of their origin. The New Testament churches were independent, self-governing, democratic bodies like the Baptist churches of to-day. We originated, not at the Reformation, nor in the Dark Ages, nor in any century after the Apostles, but our marching orders are the Commission, and the first Baptist church was the church at Jerusalem. Our principles

are as old as Christianity, and we acknowledge no founder but Christ."

(2) But that there may be no doubt about the historical facts, I shall give a few quotations from the leading historians of the different denominations. I give first the statement by Dr. Withrow (Presbyterian), of Chicago, who says:

"I suppose there is not a denomination—I speak in no fulsome praise, but literally—I think there is not a denomination of Christians that is throughout as sound theologically as the Baptists. I believe it. After carefully considering it, I believe I am speaking the truth. Sound as my denomination is, sound as others are (and I do not cast unfriendly reflection upon any), I do say that in my humble judgment there is not an evangelical denomination in America to-day that is as true to the simple Word of God as the Baptist denomination."

The following is from Dr. Wood (Congregationalist), of Andover, Massachusetts:

"I entertain the most cordial esteem, love and confidence toward the Baptists as a denomination. I have had the freest intercourse and the sincerest friendship with Baptist ministers, theological students, and private Christians. I have wished that our denomination, the Congregationalists, was as free from erratic speculation, and as well founded in the doctrines and experimental principles of the Puritans, as the Baptists. It seems to me that they are the Christians who are likely to maintain pure Christianity and to hold fast the form of sound words."

The above quotations are from the *Baptist Flag,* issue of September 7, 1911, page 6.

T. R. Burnett, a leading Disciple editor of Texas, says:

"The Baptists have connection with the Apostles through their line of succession, which extends back three hundred and fifty years, where it connects with the Waldensian line, and reaches to the apostolic day. This is not a Baptist line, but the Baptists have connection with this line, and through it have connection with the Apostles. We were speaking about successional connection. Baptists also have connection with the Apostles in what they teach and practice" (*Christian Messenger,* Dec. 8, 1886).

Mr. Campbell himself, in "Born of Water" (pp. 69 and 70), says:

"The Baptists can trace their origin to Apostolic times and produce unequivocal testimony of their existence in every century to the present time; and the model of their peculiarities, the Scriptures themselves afford. First century, Anno Domini 33, we read, in a well-attested history, of a large Baptist church which was founded and exhibited as a grand model, by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit; on the day of Pentecost three thousand souls were illuminated, led to repentance, converted, baptized, and added to the church. The history of this church, and of many others like it, is clearly and forcibly written by an inspired writer, styled Luke the physician. This Luke is the oldest ecclesiastical writer in the world. He writes a history of the Christian church for a little better than thirty years. See his treatise styled 'Acts of the Apos-

tles' (chap. 2:41, 42)." ("The Christian Name," by W. H. Burnam, A.M., D.D., p. 63.)

Not only in the quotation just made from Mr. Campbell is it proven that the Baptist Church is the Christian church of Pentecost, and that it is the church of Christ, existing in all ages since, but similar statements Mr. Campbell made in his debate with McCalla (pp. 379 and 386). So, also, in his quotation from Reinerius Saccho, the Catholic cardinal, found on page 140 of the Campbell and Purcell debate. So in his strictures on Ralston ("The Christian Name," p. 69). Now we give a remarkable statement from the great historian, Prof. John Clarke Ridpath (Methodist), of DePauw University, who says: "I should not readily admit that there was a Baptist church as far back as A. D. 100, though, without doubt, there were Baptists then, as all Christians were then Baptists." If all Christians were Baptists in A. D. 100, and it was right to be Baptists then, should not all Christians be Baptists now? But we have yet the crowning testimony of two pedobaptist historians that should convince the most incredulous of our candid opponents. In the year 1819, Dr. Ypiij, a

professor in the University of Gunningen, and Dr. J. J. Dermout, chaplain to the King of Holland, distinguished pedobaptist scholars, published a history in four volumes entitled "History of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands"—of which church they were members—in which work they devote a chapter to the history of the Dutch Baptists. Here is their conclusion:

"We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and have long, in the history of the church, received the honor of that origin. *On this account, the Baptists may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.* The perfectly correct external economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth disputed by the Romish Church—that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary; and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notions of the Catholics—that their communion is the most ancient" ("The Trilemma," by J. R. Graves, LL.D., pp. 135 and 136).

Also see the article on "Mennonites" in "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge." This is strong testimony from pedobaptists.

Now, in closing, I shall give just one quotation from a Baptist historian. The title-page of Dr. Armitage's history reads:

"A History of the Baptists Traced by Their Vital Principles and Practices from the Time of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to the Year 1886."

If there has been a perpetuity of Baptist principles in practice since the days of Christ, as the historians admit, there must of necessity have been Baptists to practice them. Who but Baptists would perpetuate and practice Baptist principles, and what does it take, anyway, to make one a Baptist, but the acceptance and practice of Baptist principles? My brethren, Baptists have a glorious heritage. We hold the grounds, both doctrinally and historically, for practical Christian union; and if the Christians of the world want a union, we invite them to meet us on the truth. These are the things for which Baptists have stood through all the ages of the Christian era, and for which they will stand until Christ shall come the second time; for the Lord shall come in great power and glory, with a shout, with a voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead shall be raised, and we who are alive shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we be with our Lord forever.

The prayer of the author is that those of his readers who are already Baptists may be stronger and better Baptists, and that those who are not Baptists may be led to see that the Baptist position is the Scriptural position. To say that "one church is just as good as another" is equivalent to saying "they are all good for nothing." No two things can differ and both be right—two things may differ and both be wrong, for there are many wrong ways, but one right.

Again, to say, "It matters not what one believes, so he does right," is the most absurd of all absurdities. What one does is determined by what one believes, except accidents, and there is no moral element in these acts. The man who is wrong in his belief as to the rights of property is a thief; the man who is wrong in his belief as to chastity is a libertine. A man's conduct can not be better than his belief, for what he does is the result of his belief. To those who say that "one church is as good as another," and that "it makes no difference to what church I go," since it does make all the difference in the world to me, suppose you go with me. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

AP 1 '61
For
APR 1 8 1977

286
N948

Nowlin, William Dudley
AUTHOR

What Baptists stand for.
TITLE
27982

Date Due	Borrower's Name
AP 1 '81	Rhymer
Fac	G M Johnson
APR 1 8 1977	Rick Tuallo

286
N948 Nowlin, William Dudley
What Baptists stand for.

27982